



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,140	07/19/2004	Jung Joon Lee	04-417	9176
34704	7590	07/19/2006	EXAMINER	
BACHMAN & LAPOINTE, P.C. 900 CHAPEL STREET SUITE 1201 NEW HAVEN, CT 06510			MCCORMICK EWOLDT, SUSAN BETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1661	

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/502,140

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

S. B. McCormick-Ewoldt

Art Unit

1661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date May 3, 2006
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

The amendment of May 3, 2006 is hereby acknowledged and entered.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

**Claims Pending**

Claims 1-10 are pending.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1 it is not clear what Applicant is meaning with the term “protective.” What is encompassed with “protective”? Clarification is needed.

All other cited claims depend directly or indirectly from rejected claims and are, therefore, also rejected under U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for the reasons set forth above

Because claims 14-19 depend either directly or indirectly upon claim 13, these claims are also indefinite.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103**

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1661

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Palladino *et al.* (6,365,768).

Applicant's claims are drawn to product-by-process claims. The product is an extract from *Acanthopanax koreanum* stem or root. Regarding product-by-process claims, note that MPEP § 2113 states that:

"[w]hen the prior art discloses a product which reasonably appears to be either identical with or only slightly different than a product claimed in a product-by-process claim, a rejection based alternatively on either section 35 U.S.C. 102 or 35 U.S.C. 103 of the statute is appropriate.... A lesser burden of proof is required to make out a case of prima facie obviousness for product-by-process claims because of their peculiar nature than when a product is claimed in the conventional fashion. In re Brown, 59 CCPA 1063, 173 USPQ 685 (1972); In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA1974)... Once the Examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior art, although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to Applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. In re Marosi, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983)."

Palladino *et al.* (6,365,768) teach using an extract of *Acanthopanax koreanum* to inhibit Tumor Necrosis Factor- $\alpha$  (i.e. TNF- $\alpha$ ), which can be attributed to viral infections such as hepatitis viruses and cirrhosis (column 2, lines 4-5; column 14, lines 29-33; column 22, lines 19-37).

The reference does not specifically teach that the product is extracted using the method claimed by Applicant in claim 1 or that the extract contains all of the characteristics claimed in claims 2, 3 and 4. However, the reference product reasonably appears to be the same product as claimed because the reference product is extracted from the same source as claimed and has the same TNF- $\alpha$  (i.e. Tumor Necrosis Factor- $\alpha$  inhibitory activity and viral infection (i.e. hepatitis)) is claimed.

However, even if the reference extract and the claimed extract are not one and the same and there is, in fact, no anticipation, the reference extract would, nevertheless, have rendered the claimed extract obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made in view of the clearly close relationship between the extract as evidenced by their shared TNF- $\alpha$  (i.e. Tumor Necrosis Factor-  $\alpha$  inhibitory activity and viral infection (i.e. hepatitis)).

Art Unit: 1661

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pyun *et al.* (5,900,434). Applicant's arguments filed May 3, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's claims are drawn to product-by-process claims. The product is an extract from *Acanthopanax koreanum* stem or root. Regarding product-by-process claims, note that MPEP § 2113 states that:

"[w]hen the prior art discloses a product which reasonably appears to be either identical with or only slightly different than a product claimed in a product-by-process claim, a rejection based alternatively on either section 35 U.S.C. 102 or 35 U.S.C. 103 of the statute is appropriate... A lesser burden of proof is required to make out a case of prima facie obviousness for product-by-process claims because of their peculiar nature than when a product is claimed in the conventional fashion. In re Brown, 59 CCPA 1063, 173 USPQ 685 (1972); In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA1974)... Once the Examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior art, although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to Applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. In re Marosi, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983)."

Pyun *et al.* (5,900,434) teach using an extract of *Acanthopanax koreanum* to inhibit Tumor Necrosis Factor- $\alpha$  (i.e. TNF- $\alpha$ ) which can be attributed to hepatocirrhosis (column 3, lines 41-55; column 4, lines 4-11).

The reference does not specifically teach that the product is extracted using the method claimed by Applicant in claim 1 or that the extract contains all of the characteristics claimed in claims 2, 3 and 4. However, the reference product reasonably appears to be the same product as claimed because the reference product is extracted from the same source as claimed and has the same TNF- $\alpha$  (i.e. Tumor Necrosis Factor- $\alpha$  inhibitory activity and viral infection (i.e. hepatitis)) is claimed.

However, even if the reference extract and the claimed extract are not one and the same and there is, in fact, no anticipation, the reference extract would, nevertheless, have rendered the claimed extract obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made in view of the clearly close relationship between the extract as evidenced by their shared TNF- $\alpha$  (i.e. Tumor Necrosis Factor-  $\alpha$  inhibitory activity and viral infection (i.e. hepatitis)).

#### Summary

No claim is allowed.

Art Unit: 1661

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Susan B. McCormick-Ewoldt whose telephone number is (571) 272-0981. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 6:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Anne Marie Grunberg, can be reached on (571) 272-0975. The official fax number for the group is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sbme

  
**CHRISTOPHER R. TATE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**